



**AQUIND Limited**

---

## **AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR**

Appendix A - Meeting Minutes between the  
Applicant and PCC on the 8 January 2021

The Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)

Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(c)

Document Ref: 7.9.41.1

PINS Ref.: EN020022

**AQUIND Limited**

---

# **AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR**

Appendix A - Meeting Minutes between the  
Applicant and PCC on the 8 January 2021

**PINS REF.: EN020022**

**DOCUMENT: 7.9.41.1**

**DATE: 05 MARCH 2021**

WSP

WSP House

70 Chancery Lane

London

WC2A 1AF

+44 20 7314 5000

[www.wsp.com](http://www.wsp.com)

## DOCUMENT

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Document</b>       | <b>7.9.49.1 Appendix A - Meeting Minutes between the Applicant and PCC on the 8 January 2021</b> |
| <b>Revision</b>       | 001  |
| <b>Document Owner</b> | WSP  |
| <b>Prepared By</b>    | Stacey Gander  |
| <b>Date</b>           | 05 March 2021  |
| <b>Approved By</b>    | Ian Fielding   |
| <b>Date</b>           | 05 March 2021  |



# MINUTES OF MEETING

|                        |   |                     |                 |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| <b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>  | 62100616  | <b>MEETING DATE</b> | 08 January 2021 |
| <b>PROJECT NAME</b>    | AQUIND Interconnector   | <b>VENUE</b>        | Teams Meeting   |
| <b>CLIENT</b>          | AQUIND Limited  | <b>RECORDED BY</b>  | MW              |
| <b>MEETING SUBJECT</b> | Meeting with Portsmouth City Council – ‘Keeping in Touch’ Meeting |                     |                 |

|                                 |  |   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>ATTENDEES/<br/>APOLOGIES</b> | <u>PCC</u><br>Lorraine Astill– Principal Regulatory Services Officer<br>Ian Maguire – Assistant Director Planning & Economic Growth<br>Edward Chetwynd-Stapylton – Development Management Team Leader<br>Paddy May - Corporate Strategy Manager<br>Vernon Nash - Business Partner<br>Leanne Rook - PMO Delivery Manager<br>Dave Stribling - Parks Contract Supervisor<br>James Dewey – Gateley Hamer<br>Peter Hayward - Director, Island Highway and Transport Consultants<br>Harvey Cable – Flood Risk Officer<br>Hayley Trower – Air Quality Lead<br>Steve Flynn - Principal Traffic & Development Planning Engineer | <u>AQUIND:</u><br>Vladimir Temerko – AQUIND Limited<br>Elena Ivanova – AQUIND Limited<br>Marcus Wood – WSP (Planning)<br>Martyn Jarvis – HSF<br>Ian Fielding – WSP (Transport)<br>Alan Cowan – WSP (Transport)<br><u>Apologies:</u><br>Alan O Sullivan, Avison Young<br>Chris Williams – WSP (Transport)<br>Cassie Fountain – WSP (Planning)<br>Tom Beckford – becg |
| <b>CONFIDENTIALITY</b>          | <b>Confidential</b>  |   |

| ITEM | SUBJECT  | Action | Due |
|------|--|--------|-----|
| 1.   | <b>Welcome</b><br>MW welcomed all to the meeting, and noted that the meeting would revert to the agenda for the previous meetings rather than focussing on the SoCG which would be taken forward separately. |        |     |

MEETING NOTES

| ITEM | SUBJECT   | Action                | Due |
|------|---|-----------------------|-----|
| 2.   | <p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p> <p>PH noted that PCC was still going through the transport information received at Deadline 6. PH acknowledged the limitations that applied to the strategic transport model and was happy that use of the model had been taken as far as was possible. However, he questioned whether the limitations have been addressed around interventions as the Safety Technical Note for Eastern Road and FTMS both suggest impacts may arise but do not appear to address them. The interventions are not reflected in the model and this raises queries on model validity.</p> <p>PH also noted that some of the mitigation proposed through signage – with re-routing of traffic is not addressed in the model. Routes off Eastern Road are the main concern and the Safety Note has not picked these up. IF suggested an offline conversation to discuss this concern and agreed to review the points raised. PH noted that the Joint Bay Report suggests some bays will intrude into the carriageway and he wanted to see more mitigation than programming and signage – e.g. discouraging use of specific routes and speed controls. The impact of these measures on the model then needs to be addressed and conclusions drawn as to whether the model remains valid. PH suggested there was some way to go on this and confirmed that full comments from PCC on the Safety Note and FTMS update would be provided at Deadline 7. IF noted that it would make further responses from the Applicant difficult if feedback was not available until Deadline 7 and PM agreed that PCC will respond earlier if it can and a meeting to discuss is being set up.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: In further discussions between the Applicant and PCC the geographic area of concern to PCC has been confirmed as the southern section of Eastern Road. A meeting is being arranged with PCC to run through how the FTMS can have other measures added to provide downstream flexibility as to how the roads joining Eastern Road can be treated, in the event that diverting traffic is shown to occur.</i></p> <p>PH repeated that the limitations of the strategic model were acknowledged but that PCC’s concern was that the Applicant’s information was not responding to those limitations. He noted that a further issue was that by its nature the model reflects a ‘settled down’ state of traffic patterns. The short terms effects of the Proposed Development were not reflected in the model. MJ reminded the meeting that the Applicant has looked at diversions and signage strategy and there was a need to focus on those measures and not the shortcomings of the model. PH agreed but suggested it needs a sense check and possible manual interventions to allow that. Finally, joint bays are shown in the carriageway at sections 18 and 19 at Farlington. Please can the Applicant address this query before Deadline 7.</p> | <p>WSP</p> <p>WSP</p> |     |

MEETING NOTES

| ITEM | SUBJECT  | Action | Due          |
|------|--|--------|--------------|
| 3.   | <p><b>Statement of Common Ground</b></p> <p>MW noted that both the Applicant and PCC had submitted unilateral SoCG documents at Deadline 6 and WSP would assemble a combined draft to facilitate further discussion.</p>   | WSP    |              |
| 4.   | <p><b>Allotments</b></p> <p>No matters were raised for discussion concerning the allotments (but see AOB).</p>   |        |              |
| 5.   | <p><b>Framework Management Plan – Recreational Impacts</b></p> <p>DS asked about the depth of cable duct installation at Farlington Playing Fields.<br/> <i>Post meeting note this was confirmed as 750mm below ground level to top of the concrete cable duct and a 400mm depth duct, giving a total depth to base of trench of 1150mm as shown in Appendix 2 of the Applicant's Post Hearing Notes:</i><br/> <a href="https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003436-7.9.22.2%20Applicant's%20Post%20Hearing%20Notes%20-%20Appendix%202.pdf">https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003436-7.9.22.2%20Applicant's%20Post%20Hearing%20Notes%20-%20Appendix%202.pdf</a> (noting that installation at the playing fields will be the same as shown in the drawing which refers to typical highway land installation.</p> |        |              |
| 6.   | <p><b>Update on Fort Cumberland Car Park</b></p> <p>Reinstatement of the car park at the ORS was discussed and MW confirmed that a plan and outline specification for the resurfacing would be provided to PCC before Deadline 7 for comment.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: Draft car park reinstatement proposal issued to PCC 19-01-2021.</i></p>   | WSP    | w/c 18-01-21 |
| 7.   | <p><b>Coastal Partnership</b></p> <p>No matters were raised for discussion concerning Coastal Partnership.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: The Applicant can confirm that discussions are continuing to address potential clashes between the Proposed Development and the Coastal Partnership flood defence scheme.</i></p>  |        |              |
| 8.   | <p><b>Land Discussions</b></p> <p>JD noted that Heads of Terms for the landscape land at the ORS was still awaited from the Applicant and that the arrangements for securing the necessary controls for that land were still to be agreed.</p>   | AOS    |              |
| 9.   | <p><b>PPA (Post Consent and Pre-Consent)</b></p> <p>The PPA was discussed and MJ advised that he was shortly to provide PCC with a list of approvals needed from PCC post consent.</p>   | HSF    |              |
| 10.  | <p><b>Acoustic Impact/EHO Queries</b></p> <p>AQUIND has provided responses to all of the matters raised on this subject at D4 .</p> <p>There were no comments on this issue as IM confirmed that PCC's EHO was on leave.</p>   |        |              |

## MEETING NOTES

| ITEM | SUBJECT   | Action | Due |
|------|---|--------|-----|
| 11.  | <p><b>Questions/AOB</b></p> <p>IM noted that some allotment holders were concerned that they did not appear in the updated Book of Reference submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 6 and noted that 50 allotment holders reported they had responded to the notifications received from the Applicant via PCC at the end of November but IM had been advised only 11 additional names were in the updated BoR although he acknowledged that information might not be correct. MJ confirmed there were significantly more than 11 names added to the BoR at Deadline 6 but that it would need to be updated further at Deadline 7 because not all the responses had been received in time.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: 129 allotment holders were added to the Book of Reference at Deadline 6, all of which can be identified in the Tracked Book of Reference (REP6-023) in the relevant allotment plots (10-12, 10-13, 10-14, 10-14a and 10-14b). These allotment holders were included from Land Interests Questionnaires that were returned to WSP by 17th December 2020, noting that responses were requested to be sent back for 15th December 2020.</i></p> <p><i>Since 17th December 2020 we have received an LIQ response from 36 allotment holders who will be added to the Book of Reference at Deadline 7.</i></p> <p>PH raised the matter of pre and post-works condition surveys and suggested that an account of what will and will not be included in the way of surveys needed to be set out in a section of the CTMP. PH noted that a scanner survey would be needed for the principal routes affected. This reflected standard requirements.</p> |        |     |

### NEXT MEETING

The next 'Keeping in Touch' Meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021. Time 9-10.30am.**

